REMARKS

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over WO 98/10111

(English equivalent U.S. Patent No. 6,136,101 to Sugawara et al.).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over reference was

applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of acknowledged prior art admission.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleged that applicants failed to point out the

temperature difference between A1 and eutectoid temperature. Also, in the Advisory Action, the

Examiner alleged that "Figures 21 and 22 as relied by applicants fail to support/define normal

temperature."

Accorsingly, Claim 5 have been further amended to recite "heating said Fe-based alloy

material setting an average rate H_R of heating from about a room temperature to a point A₁ in an

Fe-C based equilibrium diagram to be in a range of 0.5° C/sec $\leq H_R \leq 6.0^{\circ}$ C /sec, and setting a

maximum temperature gradient T_G of the inside of the Fe-based alloy material per unit distance

to be at $T_G \le 7^{\circ}$ C/mm." The relevant portion of the specification has also been similarly

amended. The amendment is supported by Figs. 21 and 22. Figs. 21 and 22 he heating is started

from about a room temperature. A person of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand

that the present invention is directed to heating from about the room temperature because these

figures indicate that the Fe-based material samples were heated from about the room temperature.

Also, the amendment is supported by the common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art

Page 5

Response After Final

Application No. 10/615,193

Attorney Docket No. 000138A

that heating start from about a room temperature where heating is not mentioned before the start

of the particular heating.

Regarding the difference between the eutectoid point and eutectic point, please see the

Remarks in the previous response.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants

request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate

extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect

to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 48,075

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar